

13th March, 1960

COCOM Document No. 3711.33/3 B

COORDINATING COMMITTEERECORD OF DISCUSSIONON A STATEMENT BY THE GERMAN DELEGATECONCERNING THE INTERPRETATION OF ITEM 1133(a) - VALVES, COCKS ETC.7th March, 1960

Present: Belgium (Luxembourg), Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

Reference: COCOM Document No. 3711.33/2.

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to a statement by the German Delegate concerning the interpretation of Item 1133(a) and invited Delegates to state their Governments' views on the question submitted by the German Delegation as set out in COCOM Document No. 3711.33/2.

2. The FRENCH Delegate stated that, in view of the fact that the only difference between normal valves and refrigeration valves lay in an extension of the spindle, the competent French authorities considered that it would not be claimed that the latter, which were capable of being used at temperatures below -130°C, were "specially designed" to operate at such temperatures. The French Delegation therefore shared the view expressed by the German authorities and raised no objection to their issuing the requested licence.

3. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate stated that the department in the United Kingdom which had studied the German request had expressed surprise that any normal refrigeration valve should be capable of use at temperatures below -130°C, since valves for these extremely low temperatures required, in particular, very special gland packing and generally had to be made to a much higher standard than normal refrigeration valves. Nevertheless, if the German valves could be used for both purposes, the department concerned were prepared to agree that they could not be regarded as "specially designed" for the lower temperatures and therefore did not come within the terms of the definition in Item 1133(a); the mere addition of an extension spindle would not in any way affect the performance of the valve itself and would not invalidate this conclusion.

4. The UNITED STATES Delegate stated that he had only received his authorities' preliminary views so far. Their position was based on considerations similar to those of the United Kingdom experts, but they had drawn different conclusions. The United States authorities considered that, in view of their alloy composition, the valves concerned had probably been specially designed for use at both extremely low and extremely high temperatures, and thus in all probability were subject to embargo. Before stating their final views, however, they wished to examine the question more closely and, to this end, would be grateful to the German authorities if they would be good enough to answer the following questions:

1. What importance was attached by the German authorities to the "high-temperature armatures" referred to in their statement?
2. What should be understood by "Austenite, quality V4.A"?
3. What was the internal flow diameter of these valves?

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- 2 -

COCOM Document No. 3711.33/3 E

5. Replying to his United States colleague's questions in the same order, the GERMAN Delegate stated:
1. The German authorities had alluded to "high-temperature armatures" solely by analogy with the procedures employed to protect the workers' hands.
  2. Austenite, quality V4.A, as indicated in the German statement, was a special steel containing 18% chromium, 8% of nickel and 2% of molybdenum.
  3. He could not state any figure for the internal flow diameter of these valves, but would endeavour to obtain this information.
6. The BELGIAN Delegate stated that the Belgian authorities considered that the valves in question had not been specially designed to operate at temperatures below  $-130^{\circ}\text{C}$ . They therefore believed that the German authorities' interpretation was correct and that these valves were not covered by Item 1133(a).
7. The DANISH, ITALIAN and JAPANESE Delegates stated that their authorities shared the German authorities' opinion that these valves could not be considered to be specially designed to operate at low temperatures. Consequently they had no objection to the issue by the German authorities of the requested licence.
8. The NETHERLANDS Delegate stated that the Netherlands authorities would welcome information as to the various civilian uses to which the valves concerned were put within the refrigeration industry.
9. The GERMAN Delegate stated that he was unable to reply on this point, and that all he had wished to discover was whether the Committee shared the view that the valves concerned were normal valves and did not come within the terms of the definition in Item 1133(a).
10. The COMMITTEE, noting that all Delegations, with the exception of those of the Netherlands and the United States, had replied to the question put by the German authorities, agreed to hear the final views of these two Delegations on the 17th March.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~